

Comment on “Chiral Suppression of Scalar-Glueball Decay”

Z.F.Zhang and H.Y.Jin

*Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics, Department of Physics,
Zhejiang University, Zhejiang Province, People's Republic of China*

PACS numbers: 11.30.Rd, 12.38.Lg, 12.39.Mk

To identify glueballs in experiments is really a tough job. Based on the perturbative theory, the author of ref.[1] suggested that the SU(3) flavor symmetry is probably strongly broken in two-body decays of scalar glueball. If this allegation is valid, mixing between scalar glueballs and $\bar{q}q$ quarkonia should be chiral-suppressed. To our knowledge, such a conclusion seems too simple and not reliable. The problem arises from the fact that non-perturbative effects are not negligible in this case. In the constituent quark model, the quarks dress with gluons, so that the masses of u and d quarks are around 300 MeV and the mass of s quark is about 400 MeV. Then the difference between production rates of $\bar{s}s$ and $\bar{u}u$, $\bar{d}d$ should not be so large as that claimed by the author of reference [1]. This can be directly tested by the experimental data for the decays of $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ (0^{++}). This $\bar{c}c$ charmonium first decays into gluons then the gluons convert into light hadrons. From the particle data book[4], $\Gamma(\chi_{c0}(1P) \rightarrow KK)/\Gamma(\chi_{c0}(1P) \rightarrow \pi\pi) \approx 1.1$, so the SU(3) flavor symmetry seems to be nicely respected. Theoretically the natural understanding of this fact is that, the U(1) chiral symmetry can be broken by either QCD vacuum or light quark masses. The first mechanism does not break the SU(3) flavor symmetry whereas the second one does. The famous U(1) puzzle indicates that the first mechanism dominates at low energy, i.e. a left-handed fermion can convert into a right-handed fermion by exchanging instantons rather than through the current quark masses. Such instanton-induced effects can be estimated in terms of the Instanton Liquid Model. In order to make a comparison, just following the method given in [1], we set the two gluons on shell and keep only the leading order in the coupling α_s . Indeed, a full comparison order by order in the coupling α_s expansion is impossible at present and beyond the scope of this comment.

According Chanowitz's method[1], we obtain the ratio of the decay widths (Γ_1 only includes the perturbative contribution and Γ_2 refers to the instanton effects) as

$$\frac{\Gamma_1(G_0 \rightarrow \bar{s}s)}{\Gamma_2(G_0 \rightarrow \bar{q}q)} = \frac{9}{16\pi^2} \frac{m_s^2 m^{*2}}{M_G^4} \frac{\ln^2((1+\beta)/(1-\beta))}{n^2 \rho^6 A^2 (1+\beta^2)}, \quad (1)$$

where q can be u , d and s quarks. The parameter A is defined as

$$A = \int_0^{\theta_\Lambda} d\theta \sin \theta \int_0^1 d\alpha \frac{K_1((M_G/2)\rho\sqrt{1+\beta^2+2\beta\cos\theta}/\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)})}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(M_G/2)\sqrt{1+\beta^2+2\beta\cos\theta}} (3+\beta\cos\theta) \\ + \int_{\theta_\Lambda}^\pi d\theta \sin \theta \int_0^1 d\alpha \frac{K_1(\Lambda\rho/\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)})}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(M_G/2)\sqrt{1+\beta^2+2\beta\cos\theta}} (3+\beta\cos\theta). \quad (2)$$

The upper bound of the integral θ_Λ is defined as

$$\theta_\Lambda = \cos^{-1} \frac{1}{2\beta} (4\Lambda^2/M_G^2 - 1 - \beta^2), \quad (3)$$

and Λ is a scale cut-off which removes the infrared divergence in the McDonald function K_1 .

The other parameters employed in the phenomenological analysis are[2, 3]

$$\rho = 1/0.6 \text{ GeV}, \quad n = 8 \times 10^{-4} \text{ GeV}^4, \quad (4)$$

$$m^* = 0.086 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}, \quad M_G = 1.65 \text{ GeV}. \quad (5)$$

The cut-off Λ is set within the range of 200 MeV $\sim$ 500 MeV. We find that $\Gamma_1(G_0 \rightarrow \bar{s}s)/\Gamma_2(G_0 \rightarrow \bar{q}q)$ is in the region of 0.04 $\sim$ 0.4. It is shown that the instanton effect is more important. When we choose the glueball mass as $M_G = 5 \text{ GeV}$, $\Gamma_1(G_0 \rightarrow \bar{s}s)/\Gamma_2(G_0 \rightarrow \bar{q}q)$ is in the region of 0.09 $\sim$ 1.0. This result is consistent with the experimental data for the two-body decays of $\chi_{c0}(1P)$.

Acknowledgments

The work was supported by NSFC and ZJNSF.

-
- [1] M.Chanowitz, *Phys.Rev.Lett.***95**, 172001(2005).
 - [2] T.Schäfer and E.V.Shuryak,*Rev.Mod.Phys.***70**, 323(1998).
 - [3] P.Faccioli and E.V.Shuryak,*Phys.Rev.***D64**, 114020(2001).
 - [4] S.Eidelman *et al.* (Particle Data Group),*Phys.Lett.***B592**, 1(2004).